Mobile Driver License RFP 17081

Questions Set 2:

Q1. If a vendor provides a combined proposal for multiples SOW areas, would scoring and award of the various SOW sections be performed independently? For example, would a lowers score on Design and Branding have any impact on a higher score for Implementation and Application Support?

R1. Scoring will be performed independently.

Q2. Could the State clarify if the Appendix A Flag mDL abuse items are in scope for this procurement as core functions to be delivered with the application?

R2. 3.5.3 Supplemental Use Cases are not in scope for this procurement.

Q3. FedRAMP authorization to operate is granted at each layer of the cloud technology stack (IaaS, PaaS, SaaS). At which layer of the cloud technology stack is FedRAMP authorization to operate required?

R3. The Hosting statement of work assumes PaaS. The implementation and application support statement of work assumes SaaS.

Q4. What is the percentage of uptime required for the proposed system?

R4. Per 3.6.3 Hosting Scope of Work #95, >=99.99% uptime is required.

Q5. Can Iowa Department of Transport clarify their requirements for the authentication of mDLs to ensure the application, and credential contained within it, are genuine? What minimum cryptographic requirements do Iowa DOT have for the signing and protecting of data stored on a mobile device?

R5. Vendor responses should include their proposed approach to cryptography and authentication for their mDL solution.

Q6. Can Iowa DOT clarify further their requirements for a digital authentication of an mDL in a disconnected state? What requirement for digital authentication and establishment of genuine privileges are expected?

R6. Vendor responses should include their proposed approach on how they will fulfill the 'authenticate mDL digitially, in a disconnected state' use case.

Q7. Once selected, when would the winning bidder commence start of the project?

R7. The contract is scheduled to begin on November 1, 2016.

Q8. Is it mandatory to have a Bid Bond in place along with our bid?

R8. A Bid Bond is not required.

Q9. Measuring bugs per 1000 lines of code promotes writing more code for doing the same job. Shouldn't the measure be total number of defects found during UAT? Also, does severity of bugs matter in this case?

R9. Per 3.6.2 'Implementation and Application Support Scope of Work' #75. Less than 1 error/defects per 1000 lines of code found during UAT #76. 100% of functional requirements met, unless omitted or changed requirements are agreed upon by both the vendor and the Iowa DOT. This requirement is included to ensure quality code is produced with minimal rework required.

Q10. Can servers for the Iowa project be in AWS Government cloud?

R10. Yes, as long as the rest of the requirements under 'Hosting Scope of Work' are met.

Q11. Are there requirements for Staging versus Production requirements?

R11. Responders to 3.6.2 'Implementation and Application Support Scope of Work' should include their proposed approach for development and QA systems.

Q12. Do performance and other monitoring systems need to be integrated into existing tools managed by the State of Iowa or can separate systems for monitor servers, mobile and backend applications exist?

R12. Responders may propose separate systems for performance and monitoring system and should any include integration interfaces available.

Q13. What are specific requirements for integration with logging and data analysis systems?

R13. Responders should propose the capabilities and scope of their logging and data analysis solution.

Q14. Link is broken to "Formal Standard Terms and Conditions" page on the Iowa website

R14. The link has been fixed.

Q15. Please clarify if the mDL is to be hosted on the Apple Wallet and Google Wallet platforms (both of which are payment functionality platforms) or be designed to be compatible with iOS and Android (and Microsoft) mobile phones? Partnership agreements with Apple and Google are highly confidential and not subject to disclosure to third parties (including Iowa DOT). Furthermore, all that app developers need to do is enroll with Google and Apple (and Microsoft) Push Notification services – these are standard service subscriptions.There are thousands of app developers using these mechanisms and no "partnership agreement" is required.

R15. Responders should propose how their solution will be compatible with both iOS and android and describe their approach on how they will engage Apple and Google for potential inclusion of the mDL in the wallet platforms.

Q16. Appendix A – High Level Requirements Traceability Matrix, # 79 Reference is made to ISO 18013, but full compliance is not mandatory. Will Iowa DOT consider making this a mandatory requirement to enable interoperability, not only across jurisdictions, but possibly globally as mDL initiatives are deployed?

R16. As ISO 18013 is still being developed in regards to the mDL, the Iowa DOT understands that initial deployment of our mDL may precede ISO 18013 specifications for the mDL. Responding vendors should be aware that the Iowa DOT intends follow ISO 18013 regarding the mDL and the proposed solution should be designed with this end goal in mind.

Q17. If Clause 3.1 mentioning "…Apple and Google Wallet platform…" is a mandatory requirement it subsequently means, that iOS devices with iOS 9.x will not be supported. Is this correct?

R17. Responders should propose how their solution will be compatible with both iOS and Android and describe their approach on how they will engage Apple and Google for potential inclusion of the mDL in the wallet platforms.

Q18. Clause 3.1 mentions "…Apple and Google Wallet platform…". Is this a hard requirement or is it possible also to provide separate App

R.18. Responders should propose how their solution will be compatible with both iOS and Android and describe their approach on how they will engage Apple and Google for potential inclusion of the mDL in the wallet platforms.

Q19. Clause 3.2, the vendors is asked to participate in ISO 18103 working group. Is this a mandatory requirement?

R19. Responding vendors should be aware that the Iowa DOT intends follow ISO 18013 regarding the mDL and the proposed solution should be designed with this end goal in mind. Participation in this working group facilitates this goal and is mandatory.

Q20. Clause 3.4: The first sentence says "…Figure X…". Does "Figure X" point to "Figure 1"?

R20. Yes it does.

Q21. Clause 3.4.8: Does the term NFC imply NFC-Technology as such (use of the built in Antennae/Coil and reader chip) or does it also imply the use of secure element (NFC+SE)?

R21. NFC refers to a set of communication protocols that enable two electronic devices to establish communication. No additional technology considerations are implied.

Q22. Clause 3.5 and the table in Appendix A describe "core use cases" and "core functions". Can these two terms considered to have the same meaning?

R22. Both "core" uses cases and functions are considered mandatory.

Q23. Clause 3.5.1 says that "Each of these use cases are in the scope of this procurement". Is correct to assume that these core use cases are "mandatory" requirements?

R23. Correct.

Q24. Clause 3.5.2: Is it correct to assume, that the contextual use cases are "mandatory" requirements?

R24. Correct.

Q25. Appendix A, line 57 in table: Is "*Purge any mDL related data that is stored remotely once a user is dis-enrolled*" considered a "*core function*" or mistakenly attributed "*extended function*"?

R25. Yes, "Purge…" is considered a core function.

Q26. Appendix A, table; Is it correct to assume that "Extended function" is a "mandatory" requirement?

R26. Correct.

Q27. At "Online Enrollment - Process Flow Details" on step 2 it reads " The Use requests to…". We assume that this should read "The User requests…" Is that correct?

R27. Yes that is correct.

Q28. At "Online Enrollment - Process Flow Details" on step 10 it reads "The User recieves instructions….". It is not said how the user receives instruction. This could be Mail, eMail, SMS, Personal Service…Question: Does the vendor also have to calculate the service cost for eMailing, SMS, Mail etc.?

R28. Correct.

Q29. The RFP indicates several times that a user shall receive confirmation/instruction etc, but it is not said by which means. Question: Does the vendor also have to calculate the service cost for eMailing, SMS, Mail etc. in the response?

R29. Correct.

Q30. Is it expected, that the awarded vendor of this contract fully implements, on his own cost, the system-side or system specific "Use Case Flow Diagrams" as outlined in the RFP?

R30. Correct.

Q31. Is it correct to assume that bullet point 3 contains the "freshness factor or component" for the contents of the mDL and it has nothing to do with the validity of the mDL?

R31. Correct.

Q32. The RFP asks for Barcode, Bluetooth, Wifi and NFC communication. Which one is the mandatory form of communication within the Iowa?

R32. Per 3.5.2.1 'Contextual Use Case 1 – Scan mDL Barcode', use of the 2-d barcode for the purposes of supporting existing barcode readers is mandatory. Additional communication technologies should be proposed by the vendors to facilitate communication between an authenticator and the mDL.

Q33. In order to properly implement a Interoperable in-state as well-out-of-state mDL, public key distribution is needed as offline authentication is mandatory according to the current talks in the ISO 18013-5 group for interoperability compliance. Nevertheless, a ISO 18013 Driver's License to be interoperable needs to have a public key distribution (PKD) in place. Are this costs considered within this RFP?

R33. Yes, if the vendor's proposed solution requires a PKD aspect.

Q34. Currently, Bluetooth and Wifi do not guarantee privacy since they emit a unique ID which can be monitored and tracked. Is Iowa DOT aware on this circumstance?

R34. No. Any communication protocol used by a vendor proposed solution should include an evaluation of the protocol, including privacy considerations and mitigations.

Q35. We understand that "Supplemental Use Cases" are not "mandatory" requirements and not scope of this RFP. Is this understanding correct?

R35. Correct.The Supplemental Use Cases are provided as potential future enhancements that may be considered as part of the development of the solution's architecture.

Q36. "Responder is able to demonstrate a partnership with either Apple and Google" - How does the IOWA DOT define 'Partnership'?

R36. Responders should propose how their solution will be compatible with both iOS and Android and describe their approach on how they will engage Apple and Google for potential inclusion of the mDL in the wallet platforms. Vendors should include an overview of any past projects that they have worked on in collaboration with Apple or Google.

Q37. Based on the answer to the above question: Is this 'Partnership' considered a mandatory requirement as defined?

R37. Correct.

Q38. Is it possible to operate the requested hosting service out-of-state so long as the data stays within the United States?

R38. Yes

Q39. We assume that the supplier will be providing resources for test execution. Are state resources also involved within the test execution efforts? If yes, at what stages?

R39. Assumption is correct. State resources will be involved as needed for User Acceptance Testing and Integration Testing with State's other computer systems as needed.

Q40. By mentioning "Use defect tracking system for all development and test activities" does this mean that the supplier of the Independent Testing also hosts the bug tracking system of the Development/Implementation vendor?

R40. Yes.

Q41. Are we correct to assume that the supplier of the Independent Testing is also involved in providing input towards the development of requirements as related to testing? Requirements responsibilities are defined in 3.6.2 #19,#20 as the responsibility of Implementation supplier. Do we understand that the testing supplier will be involved early enough within the project to also provide test-driven inputs into design?

R41. Yes.

Q42. Should we interpret this that an offer for independent testing should include all activities that we believe to be necessary, even if certain items are less explicitly mentioned in the table with specific scope requirements? (for example security architecture review)

R42. Yes.

Q43. What is the expected longevity of the defect tracking system for auditing purposes?

R43. To be determined, but no less than the contract length associated with Independent Testing Scope of Work.

Q44. In reference to the "mutually agreed Defect tracking system" who are the parties you expect will be utilizing this system?

R44. Vendors awarded the statements of work would be able to access the system, as well as, relevant State project/product staff members.

Q45. Are there specifications or requirements for the Defect tracking system? How many defect tracking systems will you implement and do you have any constraints around the number you will implement?

R45. Vendors awarded the statements of work should be able to access the defect tracking system.

Q46. Can you confirm that source code will be made available by the mDL Implementation and Application Support vendor to the Independent Testing vendor?

R46. Yes. Per 3.6.3 Independent Testing Scope of Work #46

Q47. Is infrastructure level security (i.e the hosting provider) be in scope for the security testing?

R47. Yes.